UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/720,710	11/24/2003	Krishnaraju Varadarajan	031599/261149	5368	
826 7590 06/05/2007 ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA			EXAMINER		
			ELOSHWAY, NIKI MARINA		
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000		£ 4000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
÷,	·. ••				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
·			06/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/720,710	VARADARAJAN, KRISHNARAJU			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Niki M. Eloshway	3781			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		,				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 M	arch 2007				
· <u>·</u>		action is non-final.				
3)□	<del>, _</del>					
ت (۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	.x parte Quayre, 1900 O.D. 11, 40				
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,8,11,12,16,17,21 and 22</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	Г.	*			
•	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •			
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	2) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
. a)	a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
* 0	application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ه.			
	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not receive	d.			
Attachmen	t(s)	,				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P				
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/720,710

Art Unit: 3781

•

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hambleton et al. (U.S. 4,557,398) in view of Powell (WO 99/07786) Hambleton et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the lower acid content material. Powell teaches that it is known to provide a heat seal material which comprises an ethylene acrylic acid ionomer and an ethylene methacrylic acid ionomer. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Hambleton et al. with a heat seal material of Powell, in order to improve the adherence qualities of the sealing material.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 8, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hambleton et al. (U.S. 4,557,398) in view of Hoh et al. (U.S. 4,346,196) Hambleton et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the lower acid content material. Hoh et al. teaches that it is known to provide a heat seal material which comprises an ethylene acrylic acid ionomer and an ethylene methacrylic acid ionomer. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the container of Hambleton et al. with a heat seal material of Hoh et al., in order to improve the adherence qualities of the sealing material.

## Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments filed March 2, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the HDPE in the Powell invention could not be omitted. The present claims recite a container, a closure and a heat seal consisting essentially of a blend of first and second acidic ionomers. The Powell reference teaches that "[t]he HDPE layer may form a package or container that is sealed at an opening by a delamination peel seal layer" (page 3 line 20-22 of Powell). Therefore, the HPDE layer does not have to be omitted since it could be considered the container and not an element of the peel seal.
- 5. Applicant argues that Hoh does not the claimed material because Hoh's seal material always includes a terpolymer having three or more monomers. It is the examiner's position that Hoh teaches the claimed material. Claim 1 sets forth that "the heat seal material consisting essentially of a blend of first and second acidic ionomers" (emphasis added, line 5) and "the first ionomer comprising a copolymer" (emphasis added, lines 7-8), "and the second ionomer comprising a copolymer" (emphasis added, line 9). Hoh teaches that the terpolymer could be identified as an ionomer (col. 3 lines 62-63). Hoh then states "the blends of this invention can, also be prepared from two ionomers" (col. 3 lines 63-64). For this reason Hoh teaches a seal material consisting essentially of a blend of two ionomers.

## Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

Application/Control Number: 10/720,710

Art Unit: 3781

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Niki M. Eloshway whose telephone number is 571-272-4538. The examiner can normally

be reached on Thursdays and Fridays 8 a.m. to 4 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Anthony Stashick can be reached on 571-272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 4

Art Unit 3781

nme

ANTHONY D. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700